

**Remarks**

Claims 47, 49-57 and 59-63 are canceled herein and replaced by new claims 64-74. Thus, claims 64-74 are pending in the captioned application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of the original claims in continuing applications. Support for these new claims can be found throughout the '204 application. Exemplary support is found in the locations referred to in the table below. No new matter is added by new claims 64-74.

<b>Claim</b>	<b>Support in the '204 Application</b>
64	Page 8, lines 21- 26, page 9 lines 13-27; page 10, lines 1-5; page 10, lines 15-23; Figures 1-5; and original claims 1-2 and 19-22.
65, 66	Page 18, lines 7-9; page 20, line 17, to page 24, line 15; and original claims 35-37 and 43.
67-69	Page 3, lines 2-4; Page 9, lines 28-30; and original claims 19 and 23.
70-71	Page 11, lines 19-32; page 11, line 18, to page 12, line 17; and Figure 4 ( <i>see, e.g.</i> , parts 400, 430, 450).
72-73	Page 8, lines 11-20, and original claim 4.
74	Page 21, line 19-20; page 25, line 1; page 25, lines 3-4; and page 26, line 11.

**I. Rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 47, 49-57 and 59-63 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being obvious over Harris *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,871,683) in view of Raysberg *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,106,583) and Brennan (U.S. Patent No. 5,472,672). (Office Action, page 2.)

To begin with, Applicants point out that the U.S. Supreme Court recently noted that “[a] patent composed of several elements is not proved obvious merely by demonstrating that each of its elements was, independently, known in the prior art.”

(*KSR Int'l v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. at \_\_\_ (Apr. 30, 2007) (No. 04-1350).) New independent claim now 64 recites “wherein the plurality of wells are arranged in one or more rows, at least one of the one or more rows containing sixteen wells.” None of *Harris et al.*, *Raysberg et al.* or *Brennan et al.* teach or suggest rows that contain sixteen wells. Thus, the cited references do not disclose all of the elements of the claims.

Claims 47, 49-57 and 59-63 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being obvious over Feygin *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,890,491) in view of Raysberg *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,106,583) and Brennan (U.S. Patent No. 5,472,672). (Office Action, page 4.)

As discussed above, independent claim 64 recites “wherein the plurality of wells are arranged in one or more rows, at least one of the one or more rows containing sixteen wells.” Neither Feygin *et al.*, Raysberg *et al.* or Brennan teach or suggest that wells come in rows containing sixteen wells. Therefore, the cited references do not disclose all of the elements of the claims.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

### ***Conclusion***

Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Peter G. Foiles/

Peter G. Foiles  
Agent for Applicants  
(240) 379-4173  
Registration No. 46,477

Date: July 25, 2007